

In Re Application Of:	David O. McGoveran	Examiner:	Andre D. Boyce
Serial No.	09/476,711	Group Art Unit:	3623
Filed:	Dec. 30, 1999	Atty. Docket No:	McG-003
For:	A Declarative Method	Date:	Dec. 30, 2006

### REMARKS

This replies to the Final Office Action mailed on August 18, 2006. Claims 112-190 and 192 are pending in the application. Various Claims have been amended to correct informalities in the Claims and to thus place the Claims in condition for allowance.

An Advisory Action and Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment noted that in the Claims Listing, Claim 118 had been erroneously marked as 'Previously Presented'. That has been corrected and Claim 118 is now properly marked as 'Currently Amended'. This is the sole change from the Response filed on Nov. 20, 2006. A copy of the Advisory Action and Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment is enclosed.

### Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112

The Final Office Action rejects Claims 112-190 and 192 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Generally, the business management method (e.g., Claim 112) and apparatus (e.g., Claim 192) in accordance with the embodiments of the present invention focuses on stating goals and incorporating feedback that continuously updates a business' model to the real world, and embodies an approach that integrates transactional practice (how events occur), operational practice (how the business functions), and informational practice (what is done with the knowledge generated during transactions and/or operations). The information about a process (how it is to be done), its expectations (what the process is meant to attain), its context (what the real-world conditions are actually like),